



GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

# Chandigarh Administration Gazette

Published by Authority

---

No. 16] CHANDIGARH, MONDAY, FEBRUARY 10, 2020 (MAGHA 21, 1941 SAKA)

---

CHANDIGARH ADMINISTRATION  
GOVERNMENT OF INDIA  
MINISTRY HOME AFFAIR

## Notification

The 7th January, 2020.

**NO. 9/2/11-IH(I)/2020/S.O. 120(E)1373.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 8 of the Census Act, 1948 (37 of 1948), the Central Government hereby instructs that all Census Officers may, within the limits of the local areas for which they have been respectively appointed, ask all such questions from all persons on the items enumerated below for collecting information through the houselisting and housing census schedules in connection with the Census of India 2021, namely :—

1. Building number (Municipal or local authority or census number).
2. Census house number.
3. Predominant material of floor, wall and roof of the census house.
4. Ascertain use of census house.
5. Condition of the census house.
6. Household number.
7. Total number of persons normally residing in the household.
8. Name of the head of the household.
9. Sex of the head of the household.
10. Whether the head of the household belongs to Scheduled Caste/Scheduled Tribe/other.
11. Ownership status of the census house.
12. Number of dwelling rooms exclusively in possession of the household.
13. Number of married couple(s) living in the household.
14. Main source of drinking water.
15. Availability of drinking water source.
16. Main source of lighting.

Signature Not Verified  
Digitally signed by  
JATINDER KUMAR  
Date: 2020.02.10  
17:54:49 IST  
Reason: Publication  
Location:

( 141 )

*This is Digitally Signed Gazette. To verify, visit :  
<https://egazette.chd.gov.in>*

17. Access to latrine.
18. Type of latrine.
19. Waste water outlet.
20. Availability of bathing facility.
21. Availability of kitchen and LPG/PNG connection.
22. Main fuel used for cooking.
23. Radio/transistor.
24. Television.
25. Access to internet.
26. Laptop/Computer.
27. Telephone/Mobile Phone/ Smartphone.
28. Bicycle/Scooter/Motorcycle/Moped.
29. Car/Jeep/Van.
30. Main Cereal consumed in the household.
31. Mobile Number (for census related communications only).

*Note.*—Items 1 to 5 relate to building particulars, items 6 and 7 relate to household particulars (for census house used wholly or partly as a residence), items 8 to 10 relate to head of the household, and items 9 to 31 relate only to normal household of which items 23, 24, 26, 27, 28 and 29 relate to the assets of the household.

[F.No. 9/7/2019-CD(CEN)/3]

VIVEK JOSHI, Registrar General  
and Census Commissioner, India.

CHANDIGARH ADMINISTRATION

HOME DEPARTMENT

**Notification**

The 7th February, 2020

**No. LD-2020/1912.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (3) of Section 3 of the National Security Act, 1980, the Administrator, Union Territory, Chandigarh, hereby directs, the District Magistrate, Chandigarh, to make orders, directing any person to be detained under the said Act, with a view to preventing him/her from acting in any manner prejudicial to the security of the State or from acting in any manner prejudicial to the maintenance of public order or from acting in any manner prejudicial to maintenance of supplies and services essential to the community.

This Notification shall remain in force for a period of three months, with effect from 26.02.2020.

MANOJ KUMAR PARIDA,  
Adviser to the Administrator,  
Union Territory, Chandigarh.

CHANDIGARH ADMINISTRATION  
LABOUR DEPARTMENT**Notification**

The 22nd October, 2019

**No. 13/1/9649-HII(2)-2019/17275.**—In exercise of the Powers conferred by sub-section (i) of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. 14 of 1947) read with Government of India, Ministry of Labour & Employment's Notification No. S-11025/21/2003-IR(PL) dated 28.7.2004, the undersigned hereby publish the following award bearing reference No. 32/2018 dated 10.09.2019 delivered by the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, UT, Chandigarh between :

SUMIT KUMAR S/O SHRI SOM NATH, R/O HOUSE NO. 502, PHASE-I, RAMDARBAR, INDUSTRIAL ALREA, CHANDIGARH. (Workman)

AND

1. EPICU AGRO PRODUCTS PRIVATE LIMITED, G-40, ASHOKVIHAR, PHASE-I, DELHI-110052, THROUGH ITS AUTHORISED SIGNATORY.

2. MITESH BAIJAL-MANAGING DIRECTOR, EPICU AGRO PRODUCTS PRIVATE LIMITED, G-40, ASHOK VIHAR, PHASE-I, DELHI-110052.

3. SANJEEV KALIA-VICE PRESIDENT, EPICU AGRO PRODUCTS PRIVATE LIMITED, G-40, ASHOK VIHAR, PHASE-I, DELHI-110052. (Management)

**AWARD**

1. This award shall dispose off the industrial dispute received in this Court under Section 2-A(2) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (hereinafter called 'ID Act').

2. Case of the workman in nutshell is that he was appointed on 11.03.2014 as Area Growth Officer with the management at the monthly wages of ₹ 7,000/- per month. He had completed more than 240 days continuously and remained in service of the management from 11.03.2014 till 28.11.2017. The management had violated the provisions of Section 25-F, 25-G and 25-H of the ID act.

3. The management contested the case of the workman and filed written statement that the workman had resigned from the service by his free will with effect from 23.12.2017 and had settled his accounts with the company.

4. From the pleadings of the parties, following issues were framed :—

(1) Whether the services of the workman were terminated illegally by the management, if so, to what effect and to what relief he is entitled to, if any? OPW

(2) Relief.

5. During the pendency of the present industrial dispute, learned representative for the workman pleaded no instructions on behalf of the workman as such notice to the workman was issued, which was received back with the report that no such person namely Shri Sumit Kumar is residing at the given address and there is no other address of the workman is available on record as such the present industrial dispute is dismissed in default for want of prosecution. Appropriate Government be informed. File be consigned to the record room.

(Sd.) . . . .,

(ANSHUL BERRY)

The 10.9.2019.

PRESIDING OFFICER,  
Industrial Tribunal & Labour Court,  
Union Territory, Chandigarh.  
UID No.PB0095.

CHANDIGARH ADMINISTRATION  
LABOUR DEPARTMENT

**Notification**

The 15th October, 2019

**No. 13/1/9648-HII(2)-2019/16886.**—In exercise of the Powers conferred by sub-section (i) of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. 14 of 1947) read with Government of India, Ministry of Labour & Employment's Notification No. S-11025/21/2003-IR(PL) dated 28.7.2004, the undersigned hereby publish the following award bearing reference No. 93/2016 dated 30.08.2019 delivered by the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, UT, Chandigarh between :

A.S. GORAYA S/O SHRI R.S. GORAYA R/O HOUSE NO. 3359/2, SECTOR 46-C, CHANDIGARH (Workman)

AND

1. MANAGING DIRECTOR, M/S SECURITRANS INDIA PRIVATE LIMITED, REGD. OFFICE 10, DDA, COMMERCIAL COMPLEX, NANGAL RAYA, NEW DELHI-110046.

2. REGIONAL MANAGER, NORTH, M/S SECURITRANS INDIA PRIVATE LIMITED, SCO NO.907, 1st FLOOR, NAC MANIMAJRA, UNION TERRITORY, CHANDIGARH. (Management)

**AWARD**

1. This award shall dispose off the industrial dispute received in this Court under Section 2-A(2) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (hereinafter called 'ID Act').

2. Case of the workman in brief is that he was orally appointed by management No.2 as Cash Officer and joined his service under management No.2 on 01.02.2003 on monthly wages. There is no condition of service stipulating the terms and age of employment or any agreement between the management and the workman or workmen union. The workman had rendered his continuous regular services of more than 13 years with the management No.2 and has put in continuous regular service of more than 240 days in a calendar year preceding the date of illegal termination. Management No.2 orally terminated the services of the workman with effect from 20.04.2016 without any show cause notice or notice pay, without any charge sheet or any inquiry and without any retrenchment compensation. At the time of retrenchment, the workman was drawing ₹ 10,453/-per month wages. After illegal termination of the workman from his services, the management had appointed new hands. Juniors to the workman are still in services with the management. The management has not complied with the provisions of Section 25-F, 25-G & 25-N of the ID Act. Work & conduct of the workman during the course of his employment remained very satisfactory and no inquiry, charge sheet was ever issued or initiated during his employment or after illegal termination of services. The workman is unemployed since termination of his services and has no source of livelihood and is physically, mentally and medically fit to perform his duties. After illegal termination of services, the workman issued demand notice dated 29.04.2016 demanding his reinstatement with continuity of service with full back wages but the management did not accede to the request of workman. In pursuance to above demand notice, the conciliation proceedings before the Conciliation Officer-cum-Assistant Labour Commissioner, Chandigarh stand failed.

3. The management contested the case of the workman and filed written statement raising preliminary objection that as per Clause 9 of the terms & conditions of appointment letter, Shri A. S. Goraya (claimant) would superannuate on attaining the age of superannuation i.e. 58 years. The claimant having attained the age of 58 years stands superannuated. The claimant is not a 'workman' as defined in Section 2(s) of the ID Act. On merits, it is pleaded that the claimant was appointed as Gunman *vide* appointment letter dated 06.07.2013 with effect from 01.02.2012 and not as Cash Officer as alleged. The terms & conditions of the engagement were enumerated in the appointment. As per Clause 9 of the appointment letter the claimant was to superannuate on attaining the age of 58 years. The claimant was superannuated on attaining the age of 58 years. Job of Gunman requires young and energetic person so the age of 58 years was prescribed in the appointment letter.



The claimant has put in about four years of service with the management and there is no illegal termination as alleged. The claimant retired on attaining the age of superannuation so question of issuing show cause notice or payment of notice pay, issuance of charge sheet or conducting or payment of retrenchment compensation does not arise. There was no requirement of compliance of provisions of Section 25-F, 25-G & 25-N of the ID Act as the claimant retired after attaining the age of superannuation. Other averments of the case of the claimant were denied and ultimately, it is prayed that the present industrial dispute be answered in negative.

4. From the pleadings of the parties, following issues were framed by the then Presiding Officer :—

- (1) whether Shri A. S. Goraya is not a 'workman' as defined under Section 2(s) of the ID Act ? OPM
- (2) Whether the services of Shri A. S. Goraya were terminated illegally by the management, if so, to what effect and to what relief he is entitled to, if any ? OPW
- (3) Relief.

5. In support of the case, Shri A. S. Goraya examined himself as AW1. Learned representative for the workman closed the evidence. On the other hand, the management examined Shri Ajay Kumar Pandey-Manager (Industrial Relations) as MW1. Learned representative for the management closed the evidence.

6. I have heard learned representatives for the parties and have gone through the file carefully. My findings on the issues framed in this case are as follows :—

#### **ISSUE No. 1 :**

7. Onus to prove this issue was on the management and to discharge the same, learned representative for the management has examined Shri Ajay Kumar Pandey – Manager (Industrial Relations) as MW1, who simply deposed that the claimant is not a 'workman' as defined under the ID Act but during the course of evidence, nothing has been placed on record to prove that Shri A. S. Goraya was having any supervisory or managerial powers as to exclude him from the definition of 'workman' as defined under Section 2(s) of the ID Act. There is no iota of evidence. Even during the course of arguments learned representative for the management has not pressed this issue. Accordingly, this issue is decided against the management.

#### **ISSUE No. 2 :**

8. Onus to prove this issue was on the workman and to discharge the same, learned representative for the workman has examined the workman as AW1, who deposed that he was orally appointed by the management and joined his services under management No.2 as Cash Officer on 01.02.2003 on monthly wages. At the time of appointment or joining of service, no terms & conditions of service stipulating the terms and age of employment or any agreement between the management and him or workmen union. The management had orally shifted him from A. P. Securitas Private Limited to Securitrans India Private Limited with effect from 01.02.2012. He further deposed that he had rendered his continuous regular service of more than 13 years with the management and had put in continuous regular services of more than 240 days in a calendar year preceding the date of illegal termination. Management No. 2 orally terminated the services of himself with effect from 20.04.2016 without any notice or notice pay, without any charge sheet or inquiry and without any retrenchment compensation. At the time of illegal retrenchment, he was drawing ₹ 10,453/- per month as wages. The management had joined new hands after illegal termination of himself and junior to himself are still in service. He also deposed that work & conduct of himself remained satisfactory in his entire employment and no notice or inquiry was ever initiated during his employment and he is unemployed since termination of his services.

9. Learned representative for the workman has argued that the workman was appointed by the management as Cash Officer and joined his duty on 01.02.2003 on monthly wages. The workman has rendered continuous regular service of more than 13 years with management but management No.2 orally terminated the services of the workman on 20.04.2016 without any show cause notice, notice pay, without any charge sheet, inquiry, without any retrenchment compensation whereas junior of the workman are still in service. Hence, the management has not complied with the provisions of Section 25-F, 25-G and 25-N of the ID Act. It is further argued that the workman is unemployed and he be reinstated with continuity of service and full back wages.

10. On the other hand, learned representative for the management has examined Shri Ajay Kumar Pandey-Manager (Industrial Relations) as MW1, who deposed that he is working as Manager (Industrial Relations) with the management and is authorised to depose on behalf of the management by virtue of specific powers of attorney dated 22.08.2019 Exhibit 'R1'. Neither the reference is competent nor claim statement is maintainable. The terms of the engagement of the claimant clearly stipulate in the Clause 9 of the appointment that the claimant would superannuate on attaining the age of 58 years. The claimant having attained the said age stands superannuated so no grouse can be made by the claimant. Copy of appointment letter is Exhibit 'R2'. The claimant has put in about four years with the management and there is no illegal termination of service as alleged rather the claimant has superannuated. There is no violation of Section 25-F, 25-G and 25-N of the ID Act.

11. Learned representative for the management has argued that the workman has already attained the age of 58 years so his services were superannuated. There is no illegal termination of service of the workman as the workman has apprehended. Hence there is no violation of Section 25-F, 25-G and 25-H, 25-N of the ID Act. Learned representative for the management referred to the Industrial Employment (Standard Orders) Act, 1946. He prayed for dismissal of the industrial dispute.

12. After giving my carefully consideration to the rival contention of both the sides, admittedly the workman had joined as Cash Officer/Supervisor on 01.02.2003. As per allegations levelled by the workman, he has been terminated by the management No.2 without any notice, notice pay without any retrenchment compensation, show cause notice/inquiry, charge sheet whereas representative for the management vehemently argued that he has attained the age of 58 years. Learned representative for the management placed on record Exhibit 'R2' appointment letter, Column No.9 of the same is as under:-

*"9. You will be superannuated on attaining the age of 58 of years. You may retired if found medically unfit."*

Moreover, it is admitted by the workman during his cross-examination that he served in the Indian Air Force from 09.12.1972 to 31.12.2001 and he had taken premature retirement from the Indian Air Force. He admitted that he is drawing service pension from the Indian Air Force and his date of birth is 08.04.1953. Meaning thereby it is crystal clear that he has already been attained age of 58 years and as per the Clause (3) of Schedule 1-B which deals with model standing orders, the age of retirement is 58 years, the same is reproduced as under:—

**"(3) Age of retirement.—***The age of retirement or superannuation of a workman shall be as may be agreed upon between the employer and the workman under an agreement or as specified in a settlement or award which is binding on both the workman and the employer. Where there is no such agreed age, retirement and superannuation shall be on completion of [58] years of age by the workman."*

So no notice, inquiry, charge sheet etc. was required to issue to the workman. Thus, it is a simple case of superannuation after attaining the age of 58 not a case of termination. However, the workman has liberty to approach the management for his retrial benefits, as per law if applicable and the management is directed to settle his retirement benefits, if any. In the light of discussion made above, issue is decided against the workman and in favour of the management.

**Relief :**

13. In the light of findings on the issue No.2 above, this industrial dispute is declined. Appropriate Government be informed. File be consigned to the record room.

(Sd.) . . . ,

(ANSHUL BERRY)

The 30.8.2019.

PRESIDING OFFICER,  
Industrial Tribunal & Labour Court,  
Union Territory, Chandigarh.  
UID No.PB0095.

CHANDIGARH ADMINISTRATION  
LABOUR DEPARTMENT

**Notification**

The 22nd October, 2019

**No. 13/1/9647-HII(2)-2019/17257.**—In exercise of the Powers conferred by sub-section (i) of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. 14 of 1947) read with Government of India, Ministry of Labour & Employment's Notification No. S-11025/21/2003-IR(PL) dated 28.7.2004, the undersigned hereby publish the following award bearing reference No. 92/2016 dated 30.08.2019 delivered by the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, UT Chandigarh between :

JAMNA SINGH S/O SHRI JEWASINGH R/O VPO PAROL, TEHSIL KHARAR, MOHALI, PUNJAB. (Workman)

AND

1. MANAGING DIRECTOR, M/S SECURITRANS INDIA PRIVATE LIMITED, REGD. OFFICE 10, DDA, COMMERCIAL COMPLEX NANGAL RAYA, NEW DELHI-110046.

2. REGIONAL MANAGER, NORTH, M/S SECURITRANS INDIA PRIVATE LIMITED, SCO NO. 907, 1ST FLOOR, NAC MANIMAJRA, UNION TERRITORY, CHANDIGARH. (Management)

**AWARD**

1. This award shall dispose off the industrial dispute received in this Court under Section 2-A(2) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (hereinafter called 'ID Act').

2. Case of the workman in brief is that he was orally appointed by management No.2 as Gunman and joined his service under management No.2 on 01.05.2004 on monthly wages. There is no condition of service stipulating the terms and age of employment or any agreement between the management and the workman or workmen union. The workman had rendered his continuous regular services of more than 12 years with the management No.2 and has put in continuous regular service of more than 240 days in a calendar year preceding the date of illegal termination. Management No. 2 orally terminated the services of the workman with effect from 20.04.2016 without any show cause notice or notice pay, without any charge sheet or any inquiry and without any retrenchment compensation. At the time of retrenchment, the workman was drawing ₹ 9,800/- per month wages. After illegal termination of the workman from his services, the management had appointed new hands. Juniors to the workman are still in services with the management. The management has not complied with the provisions of Section 25-F, 25-G & 25-N of the ID Act. Work & conduct of the workman during the course of his employment remained very satisfactory and no inquiry, charge sheet was ever issued or initiated during his employment or after illegal termination of services. The workman is unemployed since termination of his services and has no source of livelihood and is physically, mentally and medically fit to perform his duties. After illegal termination of services, the workman issued demand notice dated 29.04.2016 demanding his reinstatement with continuity of service with full back wages but the management did not accede to the request of workman. In pursuance to above demand notice, the conciliation proceedings before the Conciliation Officer-cum-Assistant Labour Commissioner, Chandigarh stand failed.

3. The management contested the case of the workman and filed written statement raising preliminary objection that as per Clause 9 of the terms & conditions of appointment letter, Shri Jamna Singh (claimant) would superannuate on attaining the age of superannuation i.e. 58 years. The claimant having attained the age of 58 years stands superannuated. The claimant is not a 'workman' as defined in Section 2(s) of the ID Act. On merits, it is pleaded that the claimant was appointed as Gunman *vide* appointment letter dated 06.07.2013 with effect from 01.02.2012. The terms & conditions of the engagement were enumerated in the appointment. As per Clause 9 of the appointment letter the claimant was to superannuate on attaining the age of 58 years. The claimant was superannuated on attaining the age of 58 years. Job of Gunman requires young and energetic person so the age of 58 years was prescribed in the appointment letter. The claimant has put in about four

years of service with the management and there is no illegal termination as alleged. The claimant retired on attaining the age of superannuation so question of issuing show cause notice or payment of notice pay, issuance of charge sheet or conducting or payment of retrenchment compensation does not arise. There was no requirement of compliance of provisions of Section 25-F, 25-G & 25-N of the ID Act as the claimant retired after attaining the age of superannuation. Other averments of the case of the claimant were denied and ultimately, it is prayed that the present industrial dispute be answered in negative.

4. From the pleadings of the parties, following issues were framed by the then Presiding Officer:-

- (1) Whether Shri Jamna Singh is not a 'workman' as defined under Section 2(s) of the ID Act ? OPM
- (2) Whether the services of Shri Jamna Singh were terminated illegally by the management, if so, to what effect and to what relief he is entitled to, if any ? OPW
- (3) Relief.

5. In support of the case, Shri Jamna Singh examined himself as AW1. Learned representative for the workman closed the evidence. On the other hand, the management examined Shri Ajay Kumar Pandey – Manager (Industrial Relations) as MW1. Learned representative for the management closed the evidence.

6. I have heard learned representatives for the parties and have gone through the file carefully. My findings on the issues framed in this case are as follows:-

**Issue No. 1 :**

7. Onus to prove this issue was on the management and to discharge the same, learned representative for the management has examined Shri Ajay Kumar Pandey – Manager (Industrial Relations) as MW1, who simply deposed that the claimant is not a 'workman' as defined under the ID Act but during the course of evidence, nothing has been placed on record to prove that Shri Jamna Singh was having any supervisory or managerial powers as to exclude him from the definition of 'workman' as defined under Section 2(s) of the ID Act. There is no iota of evidence. Even during the course of arguments learned representative for the management has not pressed this issue. Accordingly, this issue is decided against the management.

**Issue No. 2 :**

8. Onus to prove this issue was on the workman and to discharge the same, learned representative for the workman has examined the workman as AW1, who deposed that he was orally appointed by the management and joined his services under management No.2 as Gunman on 05.01.2004 on monthly wages. At the time of appointment or joining services, no terms & conditions of service stipulating the terms and age of employment or any agreement between the management and him or workmen union. The management had orally shifted him from A. P. Securitas Private Limited to Securitrans India Private Limited with effect from 01.02.2012. He further deposed that he had rendered his continuous regular service of more than 12 years with the management and had put in continuous regular services of more than 240 days in a calendar year preceding the date of illegal termination. Management No.2 orally terminated the services of himself with effect from 20.04.2016 without any notice or notice pay, without any charge sheet or inquiry and without any retrenchment compensation. At the time of illegal retrenchment, he was drawing ₹ 9,800/- per month as wages. The management had joined new hands after illegal termination of himself and junior to himself are still in service. He also deposed that work & conduct of himself remained satisfactory in his entire employment and no notice or inquiry was ever initiated during his employment and he is unemployed since termination of his services.

9. Learned representative for the workman has argued that the workman was appointed by the management as Gunman and joined his duty on 05.01.2004 on monthly wages. The workman has rendered continuous regular service of more than 12 years with management but management No.2 orally terminated the services of the workman on 20.04.2016 without any show cause notice, notice pay, without any charge sheet, inquiry, without any retrenchment compensation whereas junior of the workman are still in service.



Hence, the management has not complied with the provisions of Section 25-F, 25-G and 25-N of the ID Act. It is further argued that the workman is unemployed and he be reinstated with continuity of service and full back wages.

10. On the other hand, learned representative for the management has examined Shri Ajay Kumar Pandey – Manager (Industrial Relations) as MW1, who deposed that he is working as Manager (Industrial Relations) with the management and is authorised to depose on behalf of the management by virtue of specific powers of attorney dated 22.08.2019 Exhibit ‘R1’. Neither the reference is competent nor claim statement is maintainable. The terms of the engagement of the claimant clearly stipulate in the Clause 9 of the appointment that the claimant would superannuate on attaining the age of 58 years. The claimant having attained the said age stands superannuated so no grouse can be made by the claimant. Copy of appointment letter is Exhibit ‘R2’. The claimant has put in about four years with the management and there is no illegal termination of service as alleged rather the claimant has superannuated. There is no violation of Section 25-F, 25-G and 25-N of the ID Act.

11. Learned representative for the management has argued that the workman has already attained the age of 58 years so his services were superannuated. There is no illegal termination of service of the workman as the workman has apprehended. Hence there is no violation of Section 25-F, 25-G and 25-H, 25-N of the ID Act. Learned representative for the management referred to the Industrial Employment (Standard Orders) Act, 1946. He prayed for dismissal of the industrial dispute.

12. After giving my carefully consideration to the rival contention of both the sides, admittedly the workman had joined as Gunman in the month of May 2004. As per allegations levelled by the workman, he has been terminated by the management No.2 without any notice, notice pay without any retrenchment compensation, show cause notice / inquiry, charge sheet whereas representative for the management vehemently argued that he has attained the age of 58 years. Learned representative for the management placed on record Exhibit ‘R2’ appointment letter, Column No.9 of the same is as under:-

“9. *You will be superannuated on attaining the age of 58 of years. You may retired if found medically unfit.*”

Moreover, it is admitted by the workman during his cross-examination that before joining the management, he was working in the General Hospital, Sector 16, Chandigarh as LB Supervisor and he served in the General Hospital, Sector 16, Chandigarh from 1965 to 2002. He admitted that he is drawing service pension from the General Hospital, Sector 16, Chandigarh which is about ₹ 16,500/- per month and his year of birth is 1945. Meaning thereby it is crystal clear that he has already been attained age of 58 years and as per the Clause (3) of Schedule 1-B which deals with model standing orders, the age of retirement is 58 years, the same is reproduced as under :—

“(3) **Age of retirement.**—*The age of retirement or superannuation of a workman shall be as may be agreed upon between the employer and the workman under an agreement or as specified in a settlement or award which is binding on both the workman and the employer.*

*Where there is no such agreed age, retirement and superannuation shall be on completion of [58] years of age by the workman.”*

So no notice, inquiry, charge sheet etc. was required to issue to the workman. Thus, it is a simple case of superannuation after attaining the age of 58 not a case of termination. However, the workman has liberty to approach the management for his retrial benefits, as per law if applicable and the management is directed to settle his retirement benefits, if any. In the light of discussion made above, issue is decided against the workman and in favour of the management.

**Relief :**

13. In the light of findings on the issue No.2 above, this industrial dispute is declined. Appropriate Government be informed. File be consigned to the record room.

(Sd.) . . . ,

(ANSHUL BERRY)

The 30.8.2019.

PRESIDING OFFICER,  
Industrial Tribunal & Labour Court,  
Union Territory, Chandigarh.  
UID No.PB0095.

CHANDIGARH ADMINISTRATION  
LABOUR DEPARTMENT

**Notification**

The 15th October, 2019

**No. 13/1/9646-HII(2)-2019/16895.**—In exercise of the Powers conferred by sub-section (i) of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. 14 of 1947) read with Government of India, Ministry of Labour & Employment's Notification No. S-11025/21/2003-IR(PL) dated 28.7.2004, the undersigned hereby publish the following award bearing reference No. 89/2016 dated 30.08.2019 delivered by the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, UT Chandigarh between :

MANJIT SINGH, S/O SHRI JORA SINGH, R/O VILLAGE KHANIAN TEHSIL AMLOH, DISTRICT FATEHGARH SAHIB, PUNJAB. (Workman)

AND

1. MANAGING DIRECTOR, M/S SECURITRANS INDIA PRIVATE LIMITED, REGD. OFFICE 10, DDA, COMMERCIAL COMPLEX NANGAL RAYA, NEW DELHI-110046.

2. REGIONAL MANAGER, NORTH, M/S SECURITRANS INDIA PRIVATE LIMITED, SCO NO.907, 1ST FLOOR, NAC MANIMAJRA, UNION TERRITORY, CHANDIGARH. (Management)

**AWARD**

1. This award shall dispose off the industrial dispute received in this Court under Section 2-A(2) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (hereinafter called 'ID Act').

2. Case of the workman in brief is that he was orally appointed by management No.2 as Cash Officer and joined his service under management No. 2 on 01.02.2005 on monthly wages. There is no condition of service stipulating the terms and age of employment or any agreement between the management and the workman or workmen union. The workman had rendered his continuous regular services of more than 11 years with the management No. 2 and has put in continuous regular service of more than 240 days in a calendar year preceding the date of illegal termination. Management No.2 orally terminated the services of the workman with effect from 20.04.2016 without any show cause notice or notice pay, without any charge sheet or any inquiry and without any retrenchment compensation. At the time of retrenchment, the workman was drawing ₹ 9,546/-per month wages. After illegal termination of the workman from his services, the management had appointed new hands. Juniors to the workman are still in services with the management. The management has not complied with the provisions of Section 25-F, 25-G & 25-N of the ID Act. Work & conduct of the workman during the course of his employment remained very satisfactory and no inquiry, charge sheet was ever issued or initiated during his employment or after illegal termination of services. The

workman is unemployed since termination of his services and has no source of livelihood and is physically, mentally and medically fit to perform his duties. After illegal termination of services, the workman issued demand notice dated 29.04.2016 demanding his reinstatement with continuity of service with full back wages but the management did not accede to the request of workman. In pursuance to above demand notice, the conciliation proceedings before the Conciliation Officer-cum-Assistant Labour Commissioner, Chandigarh stand failed.

3. The management contested the case of the workman and filed written statement raising preliminary objection that as per Clause 9 of the terms & conditions of appointment letter, Shri Manjit Singh (claimant) would superannuate on attaining the age of superannuation i.e. 58 years. The claimant having attained the age of 58 years stands superannuated. The claimant is not a 'workman' as defined in Section 2(s) of the ID Act. On merits, it is pleaded that the claimant was appointed as Gunman *vide* appointment letter dated 06.07.2013 with effect from 01.02.2012 and not as Cash Officer as alleged. The terms & conditions of the engagement were enumerated in the appointment. As per Clause 9 of the appointment letter the claimant was to superannuate on attaining the age of 58 years. The claimant was superannuated on attaining the age of 58 years. Job of Gunman requires young and energetic person so the age of 58 years was prescribed in the appointment letter. The claimant has put in about four years of service with the management and there is no illegal termination as alleged. The claimant retired on attaining the age of superannuation so question of issuing show cause notice or payment of notice pay, issuance of charge sheet or conducting or payment of retrenchment compensation does not arise. There was no requirement of compliance of provisions of Section 25-F, 25-G & 25-N of the ID Act as the claimant retired after attaining the age of superannuation. Other averments of the case of the claimant were denied and ultimately, it is prayed that the present industrial dispute be answered in negative.

4. From the pleadings of the parties, following issues were framed by the then Presiding Officer:-

1. Whether Shri Manjit Singh is not a 'workman' as defined under Section 2(s) of the ID Act ? OPM
2. Whether the services of Shri Manjit Singh were terminated illegally by the management, if so, to what effect and to what relief he is entitled to, if any ? OPW
3. Relief.

5. In support of the case, Shri Manjit Singh examined himself as AW1. Learned representative for the workman closed the evidence. On the other hand, the management examined Shri Ajay Kumar Pandey – Manager (Industrial Relations) as MW1. Learned representative for the management closed the evidence.

6. I have heard learned representatives for the parties and have gone through the file carefully. My findings on the issues framed in this case are as follows :—

#### **ISSUE NO. 1 :**

7. Onus to prove this issue was on the management and to discharge the same, learned representative for the management has examined Shri Ajay Kumar Pandey – Manager (Industrial Relations) as MW1, who simply deposed that the claimant is not a 'workman' as defined under the ID Act but during the course of evidence, nothing has been placed on record to prove that Shri Manjit Singh was having any supervisory or managerial powers as to exclude him from the definition of 'workman' as defined under Section 2(s) of the ID Act. There is no iota of evidence. Even during the course of arguments learned representative for the management has not pressed this issue. Accordingly, this issue is decided against the management.

#### **ISSUE NO. 2 :**

8. Onus to prove this issue was on the workman and to discharge the same, learned representative for the workman has examined the workman as AW1, who deposed that he was orally appointed by the management and joined his services under management No.2 as Cash Officer on 01.02.2005 on monthly wages. At the time of appointment or joining services, no terms & conditions of service stipulating the terms

and age of employment or any agreement between the management and him or workmen union. The management had orally shifted him from A. P. Securitas Private Limited to Securitrans India Private Limited with effect from 01.02.2012. He further deposed that he had rendered his continuous regular service of more than 11 years with the management and had put in continuous regular services of more than 240 days in a calendar year preceding the date of illegal termination. Management No.2 orally terminated the services of himself with effect from 20.04.2016 without any notice or notice pay, without any charge sheet or inquiry and without any retrenchment compensation. At the time of illegal retrenchment, he was drawing ₹ 9,546/- per month as wages. The management had joined new hands after illegal termination of himself and junior to himself are still in service. He also deposed that work & conduct of himself remained satisfactory in his entire employment and no notice or inquiry was ever initiated during his employment and he is unemployed since termination of his services.

9. Learned representative for the workman has argued that the workman was appointed by the management as Cash Officer and joined his duty on 01.02.2005 on monthly wages. The workman has rendered continuous regular service of more than 11 years with management but management No.2 orally terminated the services of the workman on 20.04.2016 without any show cause notice, notice pay, without any charge sheet, inquiry, without any retrenchment compensation whereas junior of the workman are still in service. Hence, the management has not complied with the provisions of Section 25-F, 25-G and 25-N of the ID Act. It is further argued that the workman is unemployed and he be reinstated with continuity of service and full back wages.

10. On the other hand, learned representative for the management has examined Shri Ajay Kumar Pandey – Manager (Industrial Relations) as MW1, who deposed that he is working as Manager (Industrial Relations) with the management and is authorised to depose on behalf of the management by virtue of specific powers of attorney dated 22.08.2019 Exhibit ‘R1’. Neither the reference is competent nor claim statement is maintainable. The terms of the engagement of the claimant clearly stipulate in the Clause 9 of the appointment that the claimant would superannuate on attaining the age of 58 years. The claimant having attained the said age stands superannuated so no grouse can be made by the claimant. Copy of appointment letter is Exhibit ‘R2’. The claimant has put in about four years with the management and there is no illegal termination of service as alleged rather the claimant has superannuated. There is no violation of Section 25-F, 25-G and 25-N of the ID Act.

11. Learned representative for the management has argued that the workman has already attained the age of 58 years so his services were superannuated. There is no illegal termination of service of the workman as the workman has apprehended. Hence there is no violation of Section 25-F, 25-G and 25-H, 25-N of the ID Act. Learned representative for the management referred to the Industrial Employment (Standard Orders) Act, 1946. He prayed for dismissal of the industrial dispute.

12. After giving my carefully consideration to the rival contention of both the sides, admittedly the workman had joined as Supervisor on 03.01.2005. As per allegations levelled by the workman, he has been terminated by the management No. 2 without any notice, notice pay without any retrenchment compensation, show cause notice / inquiry, charge sheet whereas representative for the management vehemently argued that he has attained the age of 58 years. Learned representative for the management placed on record Exhibit ‘R2’ appointment letter, Column No.9 of the same is as under:-

*“9. You will be superannuated on attaining the age of 58 of years. You may retired if found medically unfit.”*

Moreover, it is admitted by the workman during his cross-examination that he served in the Indian Military from 1966 to 02.01.1995. He admitted that he is drawing service pension of ₹ 30,000/- from the Central Government and his date of birth is 02.01.1952. Meaning thereby it is crystal clear that he has already



been attained age of 58 years and as per the Clause (3) of Schedule 1-B which deals with model standing orders, the age of retirement is 58 years, the same is reproduced as under :—

*“(3) Age of retirement.—The age of retirement or superannuation of a workman shall be as may be agreed upon between the employer and the workman under an agreement or as specified in a settlement or award which is binding on both the workman and the employer. Where there is no such agreed age, retirement and superannuation shall be on completion of [58] years of age by the workman.”*

So no notice, inquiry, charge sheet etc. was required to issue to the workman. Thus, it is a simple case of superannuation after attaining the age of 58 not a case of termination. However, the workman has liberty to approach the management for his retrial benefits, as per law if applicable and the management is directed to settle his retirement benefits, if any. In the light of discussion made above, issue is decided against the workman and in favour of the management.

#### RELIEF :

13. In the light of findings on the issue No.2 above, this industrial dispute is declined. Appropriate Government be informed. File be consigned to the record room.

(Sd.) . . . ,

(ANSHUL BERRY),

Dated : 30.08.2019

Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal & Labour Court,  
Union Territory, Chandigarh.

#### CHANDIGARH ADMINISTRATION

#### LABOUR DEPARTMENT

#### Notification

The 15th October, 2019

**No. 13/1/9645-HII(2)-2019/16880.**—In exercise of the Powers conferred by sub-section (i) of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. 14 of 1947) read with Government of India, Ministry of Labour & Employment's Notification No. S-11025/21/2003-IR(PL) dated 28.7.2004, the undersigned hereby publish the following award bearing reference No. 87/2016 dated 30.08.2019 delivered by the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, UT, Chandigarh between:

AMRIK SINGH S/O SHRI SARDARA SINGH R/O VPO DHULKOT, DISTRICT AMBALA, HARYANA. (Workman)

AND

1. MANAGING DIRECTOR, M/S SECURITRANS INDIA PRIVATE LIMITED, REGD. OFFICE 10, DDA, COMMERCIAL COMPLEX NANGAL RAYA, NEW DELHI-110046.

2. REGIONAL MANAGER, NORTH, M/S SECURITRANS INDIA PRIVATE LIMITED, SCO NO. 907, 1ST FLOOR, NAC MANIMAJRA, UNION TERRITORY, CHANDIGARH. (Management)

#### AWARD

1. This award shall dispose off the industrial dispute received in this Court under Section 2-A(2) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (hereinafter called 'ID Act').

2. Case of the workman in brief is that he was orally appointed by management No.2 as Cash Officer and joined his service under management No.2 on 06.01.2000 on monthly wages. There is no condition of service stipulating the terms and age of employment or any agreement between the management and the workman or workmen union. The workman had rendered his continuous regular services of more than 16 years with the management No.2 and has put in continuous regular service of more than 240 days in a calendar year preceding the date of illegal termination. Management No.2 orally terminated the services of the workman with effect from 20.04.2016 without any show cause notice or notice pay, without any charge sheet or any inquiry and without any retrenchment compensation. At the time of retrenchment, the workman was drawing ₹ 17,525/-per month wages. After illegal termination of the workman from his services, the management had appointed new hands. Juniors to the workman are still in services with the management. The management has not complied with the provisions of Section 25-F, 25-G & 25-N of the ID Act. Work & conduct of the workman during the course of his employment remained very satisfactory and no inquiry, charge sheet was ever issued or initiated during his employment or after illegal termination of services. The workman is unemployed since termination of his services and has no source of livelihood and is physically, mentally and medically fit to perform his duties. After illegal termination of services, the workman issued demand notice dated 29.04.2016 demanding his reinstatement with continuity of service with full back wages but the management did not accede to the request of workman. In pursuance to above demand notice, the conciliation proceedings before the Conciliation Officer-cum-Assistant Labour Commissioner, Chandigarh stand failed.

3. The management contested the case of the workman and filed written statement raising preliminary objection that as per Clause 9 of the terms & conditions of appointment letter, Shri Amrik Singh (claimant) would superannuate on attaining the age of superannuation i.e. 58 years. The claimant having attained the age of 58 years stands superannuated. The claimant is not a 'workman' as defined in Section 2(s) of the ID Act. On merits, it is pleaded that the claimant was appointed as Gunman *vide* appointment letter dated 06.07.2013 with effect from 01.02.2012 and not as Cash Officer as alleged. The terms & conditions of the engagement were enumerated in the appointment. As per Clause 9 of the appointment letter the claimant was to superannuate on attaining the age of 58 years. The claimant was superannuated on attaining the age of 58 years. Job of Gunman requires young and energetic person so the age of 58 years was prescribed in the appointment letter. The claimant has put in about four years of service with the management and there is no illegal termination as alleged. The claimant retired on attaining the age of superannuation so question of issuing show cause notice or payment of notice pay, issuance of charge sheet or conducting or payment of retrenchment compensation does not arise. There was no requirement of compliance of provisions of Section 25-F, 25-G & 25-N of the ID Act as the claimant retired after attaining the age of superannuation. Other averments of the case of the claimant were denied and ultimately, it is prayed that the present industrial dispute be answered in negative.

4. From the pleadings of the parties, following issues were framed by the then Presiding Officer :—

1. Whether Shri Amrik Singh is not a 'workman' as defined under Section 2(s) of the ID Act ? OPM
2. Whether the services of Shri Amrik Singh were terminated illegally by the management, if so, to what effect and to what relief he is entitled to, if any ? OPW
3. Relief.

5. In support of the case, Shri Amrik Singh examined himself as AW1. Learned representative for the workman closed the evidence. On the other hand, the management examined Shri Ajay Kumar Pandey – Manager (Industrial Relations) as MW1. Learned representative for the management closed the evidence.

6. I have heard learned representatives for the parties and have gone through the file carefully. My findings on the issues framed in this case are as follows :—

**ISSUE No. 1 :**

7. Onus to prove this issue was on the management and to discharge the same, learned representative for the management has examined Shri Ajay Kumar Pandey – Manager (Industrial Relations) as MW1, who simply deposed that the claimant is not a ‘workman’ as defined under the ID Act but during the course of evidence, nothing has been placed on record to prove that Shri Amrik Singh was having any supervisory or managerial powers as to exclude him from the definition of ‘workman’ as defined under Section 2(s) of the ID Act. There is no *iota* of evidence. Even during the course of arguments learned representative for the management has not pressed this issue. Accordingly, this issue is decided against the management.

**ISSUE No.2 :**

8. Onus to prove this issue was on the workman and to discharge the same, learned representative for the workman has examined the workman as AW1, who deposed that he was orally appointed by the management and joined his services under management No.2 as Cash Officer on 06.01.2000 on monthly wages. At the time of appointment or joining his services, no terms & conditions of services stipulating the terms and age of employment or any agreement between the management and him or workmen union. The management had orally shifted him from A. P. Securitas Private Limited to Securitrans India Private Limited with effect from 01.02.2012. he further deposed that he had rendered his continuous regular service of more than 16 years with the management and had put in continuous regular services of more than 240 days in a calendar year preceding the date of illegal termination. Management No.2 orally terminated the services of himself with effect from 20.04.2016 without any notice or notice pay, without any charge sheet or inquiry and without any retrenchment compensation. At the time of illegal retrenchment, he was drawing ₹ 17,525/- per month as wages. The management had joined new hands after illegal termination of himself and junior to himself are still in service. He also deposed that work & conduct of himself remained satisfactory in his entire employment and no notice or inquiry was ever initiated during his employment and he is unemployed since termination of his services.

9. Learned representative for the workman has argued that the workman was appointed by the management as Cash Officer and joined his duty on 06.01.2000 on monthly wages. The workman has rendered continuous regular service of more than 16 years with management but management No.2 orally terminated the services of the workman on 20.04.2016 without any show cause notice, notice pay, without any charge sheet, inquiry, without any retrenchment compensation whereas junior of the workman are still in service. Hence, the management has not complied with the provisions of Section 25-F, 25-G and 25-N of the ID Act. It is further argued that the workman is unemployed and he be reinstated with continuity of service and full back wages.

10. On the other hand, learned representative for the management has examined Shri Ajay Kumar Pandey – Manager (Industrial Relations) as MW1, who deposed that he is working as Manager (Industrial Relations) with the management and is authorised to depose on behalf of the management by virtue of specific powers of attorney dated 22.08.2019 Exhibit ‘R1’. Neither the reference is competent nor claim statement is maintainable. The terms of the engagement of the claimant clearly stipulate in the Clause 9 of the appointment that the claimant would superannuate on attaining the age of 58 years. The claimant having attained the said age stands superannuated so no grouse can be made by the claimant. Copy of appointment letter is Exhibit ‘R2’. The claimant has put in about four years with the management and there is no illegal termination of service as alleged rather the claimant has superannuated. There is no violation of Section 25-F, 25-G and 25-N of the ID Act.

11. Learned representative for the management has argued that the workman has already attained the age of 58 years so his services were superannuated. There is no illegal termination of service of the workman as the workman has apprehended. Hence there is no violation of Section 25-F, 25-G and 25-H, 25-N of the ID Act. Learned representative for the management referred to the Industrial Employment (Standard Orders) Act, 1946. He prayed for dismissal of the industrial dispute.

12. After giving my carefully consideration to the rival contention of both the sides, admittedly the workman had joined as Cash Officer on 01.06.2000. As per allegations levelled by the workman, he has been terminated by the management No.2 without any notice, notice pay without any retrenchment compensation, show cause notice / inquiry, charge sheet whereas representative for the management vehemently argued that he has attained the age of 58 years. Learned representative for the respondent placed on record Exhibit 'R2' appointment letter, Column No.9 of the same is as under :—

*“9. You will be superannuated on attaining the age of 58 of years. You may retired if found medically unfit.”*

Moreover, it is admitted by the workman during his cross-examination that he served in the Indian Air Force from 1973 to 1994 and he retired from Indian Air Force on 30.11.1994. He admitted that he is drawing service pension from the Indian Air Force and his date of birth is 09.01.1955. Meaning thereby it is crystal clear that he has already been attained age of 58 years and as per the Clause (3) of Schedule 1-B which deals with model standing orders, the age of retirement is 58 years, the same is reproduced as under:-

*“(3) **Age of retirement.**—The age of retirement or superannuation of a workman shall be as may be agreed upon between the employer and the workman under an agreement or as specified in a settlement or award which is binding on both the workman and the employer. Where there is no such agreed age, retirement and superannuation shall be on completion of [58] years of age by the workman.”*

So no notice, inquiry, charge sheet etc. was required to issue to the workman. Thus, it is a simple case of superannuation after attaining the age of 58 not a case of termination. However, the workman has liberty to approach the management for his retrial benefits, as per law if applicable and the management is directed to settle his retirement benefits, if any. In the light of discussion made above, issue is decided against the workman and in favour of the management.

#### **RELIEF :**

13. In the light of findings on the issue No.2 above, this industrial dispute is declined. Appropriate Government be informed. File be consigned to the record room.

(Sd.) . . . .,

(ANSHUL BERRY)

The 30.8.2019.

PRESIDING OFFICER,  
Industrial Tribunal & Labour Court,  
Union Territory, Chandigarh.  
UID No.PB0095.



CHANDIGARH ADMINISTRATION  
LABOUR DEPARTMENT

**Notification**

The 22nd October, 2019

**No. 13/1/9650-HII(2)-2019/17304.**—In exercise of the Powers conferred by sub-section (i) of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. 14 of 1947) read with Government of India, Ministry of Labour & Employment's Notification No. S-11025/21/2003-IR(PL) dated 28.7.2004, the undersigned hereby publish the following award bearing reference No. 33/2018 dated 10.09.2019 delivered by the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, UT Chandigarh between :

NEERAJ SHARMA S/O SHRI SADHU RAM SHARMA, R/O HOUSE NO.2077, SECTOR 28-C, CHANDIGARH (Workman)

AND

1. EPICU AGRO PRODUCTS PRIVATE LIMITED, G-40, ASHOK VIHAR, PHASE-I, DELHI—110052 THROUGH ITS AUTHORISED SIGNATORY.

2. MITESH BAIJAL -MANAGING DIRECTOR, EPICU AGRO PRODUCTS PRIVATE LIMITED, G-40, ASHOK VIHAR, PHASE-I, DELHI —110052.

3. SANJEEV KALIA-VICE PRESIDENT, EPICU AGRO PRODUCTS PRIVATE LIMITED, G-40, ASHOK VIHAR, PHASE-I, DELHI—110052 (Management)

**AWARD**

1. This award shall dispose off the industrial dispute received in this Court under Section 2-A(2) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (hereinafter called 'ID Act').

2. Case of the workman in nutshell is that he was appointed on 13.06.2016 as Area Growth Officer with the management at the monthly wages of ₹ 9,500/- per month. He had completed more than 240 days continuously and remained in service of the management from 13.06.2016 till 28.11.2017. The management had violated the provisions of Section 25-F, 25-G and 25-H of the ID Act.

3. The management contested the case of the workman and filed written statement that the workman had resigned from the service by his free will with effect from 23.12.2017 and had settled his accounts with the company.

4. From the pleadings of the parties, following issues were framed :—

1. Whether the services of the workman were terminated illegally by the management, if so, to what effect and to what relief he is entitled to, if any ? OPW

2. Relief.

5. During the pendency of the present industrial dispute, learned representative for the workman pleaded no instructions on behalf of the workman as such notice to the workman was issued, which was received back with the report that the workman had vacated the said house and there is no other address of the workman is available on record as such the present industrial dispute is dismissed in default for want of prosecution. Appropriate Government be informed. File be consigned to the record room.

The 10.09.2019.

(Sd.) . . . ,  
(ANSHUL BERRY),  
PRESIDING OFFICER,  
Industrial Tribunal & Labour Court,  
Union Territory, Chandigarh.  
UID No.PB0095.

Secretary Labour,  
Chandigarh Administration.

## CHANGE OF NAME

I, Ishwar Singh, s/o Roshan Lal, # 147/1, Block-K, Colony No. 4, Industrial Area 1, Chandigarh, have changed my minor son's name from Ankit to Vansh Raj.

[72—1]

I, Balbir Singh, s/o Sh. Teju Ram, r/o 1469-A, Sector 20-B, Chandigarh, have changed my name to Balvir Singh.

[73—1]

I, I Rajender Kaur, w/o Harvinder Singh, House 3297, Sector 27-D, Chandigarh, have changed my minor son name from Sarwajit Singh Dalmotra to Sarvjit Singh.

[74—1]

I, Sohan Singh Rawat, s/o Mahesh Chander, r/o 2295-A, 37-C, Chandigarh, have changed my minor son name from Siddharth Charan Rawat to Siddharth Singh Rawat.

[75—1]

I, Abhishek, s/o Pritam Singh, r/o 587, Phase 1, Ramdarbar, Chandigarh, have changed my name to Abhishek Kumar.

[76—1]

## नाम परिवर्तन

मैं, राम प्रीत, सुपुत्र राम केवल साहनी, निवासी # 1433/27, सेक्टर 29-B, चंडीगढ़, मैंने अपना नाम राम प्रीत से बदलकर राम प्रीत साहनी रख लिया है।

[77—1]

"No legal responsibility is accepted for the contents of publication of advertisements/public notices in this part of the Chandigarh Administration Gazette. Persons notifying the advertisements/ public notices will remain solely responsible for the legal consequences and also for any other misrepresentation etc. "